



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,460	08/07/2001	Herve Lescuyer	01115	6367

23338 7590 10/23/2002

DENNISON, SCHULTZ & DOUGHERTY
1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

MENON, KRISHNAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1723

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-7

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,460

Applicant(s)

LESCUYER ET AL.

Examiner

Krishnan S Menon

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1,3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: it is unclear whether the porosity and the pore diameter of the bed of refractory particulate material recited in the claims belong to the particles in the bed, or to the interstices between the particles in the bed. For examination purposes, this would be considered as belonging to the interstices between the particles.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,4-6,8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Rieger et al (US 4,690,763).

Art Unit: 1723

Rieger (763) discloses a filtration method and (a device as in instant claim 9 – see abstract) for liquid metal comprising passing the liquid metal through a bed of refractory particulate material having open porosity between 5 and 30% (col 2 lines 23-37) as in instant claim 1. The residence time of the liquid estimated from the permeability values (col 2 lines 52-54) can be between 1 and 500 sec in a 4 to 40 cm thick filter as in instant claim 2. The filter could be 4 to 40 cm thick (col 2 lines 32-34) and the particle size could be from 0.2 to 20 mm (col 3 lines 55-58) as in instant claim 4. Material is corundum (abstract) as in instant claim 5 with porosity 5 to 30% (col 2 lines 45-48) as in instant claim 8.

Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Takashima (US 4,278,544).

Takashima (544) discloses a filtration method for liquid metals with a bed of refractory particulate material (col 4 lines 22-68) with open porosity between 5 and 30% (see table) as in instant claim 1; the pore size being between 20 and 200 microns (see table, col 3 lines 38-40) as in instant claims 3 and 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1723

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rieger (763) in view of Neidhardt et al (US 4,177,235).

Rieger (763) discloses a filtration method and (a device as in instant claim 9 – see abstract) for liquid metal comprising passing the liquid metal through a bed of corundum (instant claim 5) having open porosity between 5 and 30%(col 2 lines 23-37) as in instant claim 1. Rieger (763) discloses the methods of making the corundum particles including extrusion from electro-fused alumina (col 3 lines 37-45), but it is not by casting electro-fused alumina, cooling, crushing and screening. That process is disclosed by Neidhardt (235) (cols 3 and 4; examples). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the teaching of Neidhardt (235) to make the corundum particles instead of the teachings of Rieger (763) for the filter bed of Rieger (763) as an alternate method.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Porous ceramic filter bodies formed with beads are disclosed by Kampfer et al (US 4,678,758) and Brenzy (US 5,322,821).

Art Unit: 1723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S Menon whose telephone number is 703-305-5999. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L Walker can be reached on 703-308-0457. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Krishnan S. Menon
Patent Examiner
October 7, 2002


W. L. WALKER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700